arXiv:1612.08473v1 [math.GT] 27 Dec 2016

DOODLES ON SURFACES I: AN INTRODUCTION TO THEIR BASIC PROPERTIES

ANDREW BARTHOLOMEW
School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9RH, England
andrewb@layer8.co.uk

ROGER FENN
School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9RH, England
rogerf@sussex.ac.uk

NAOKO KAMADA
Graduate School of Natural Sciences, Nagoya City University
Nagoya, Aichi 467-8501, Japan
kamada@nsc.nagoya-cu.ac.jp

SEIICHI KAMADA
Department of Mathematics, Osaka City University
Osaka, Osaka 558-8585, Japan
skamada@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp

December 28, 2016

Abstract

Doodles were introduced in [9] but were restricted to embedded circles in the 2-sphere. Khovanov, [14], extended the idea to immersed circles in the 2-sphere. In this paper we further extend the range of doodles to any closed orientable surfaces.

keywords: doodles, immersed circles, flat virtual doodles
Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 57M25, 57M27

1 Introduction

Doodles were first introduced in [9]. The original definition of a doodle was a collection of embedded circles in the 2-sphere S^2 with no triple or higher

intersection points. Khovanov, [14], extended the idea to allow each component to be an immersed circle in S^2. Further references on circles in S^2 are [1] and [2].

In this paper, the first of a series, we further extend the range of doodles to immersed circles in closed orientable surfaces of any genus, and establish their fundamental and essential properties. In sections 2 to 4 we define a doodle in two ways and show that they are equivalent. The first definition is the one indicated above. The second is by way of planar diagrams in which triple and higher singular points are forbidden. There is a natural map from doodles to flat virtual links and the flat Kashino knot shows that this is non-trivial.

In section 5 we generalise Newman's simplification procedure to prove a Kuperberg type theorem, [16], which claims that every doodle has a unique representative with minimal genus and crossing number.

In section 6 we look at various minimal examples.

In a later paper we will consider doodle braids, biquandle invariants, cobordism of doodles, the μ invariant, Khovanov group and commutator identities.

For a united treatment of generalized knot theories, see [7].

2 Doodles on surfaces

A **doodle representative** is a map $f : \coprod_i S^1_i \to \Sigma$ from n disjoint oriented circles to a closed oriented surface Σ so that $|f^{-1}f(x)| < 3$ for all $x \in \coprod_i S^1_i$. That is, no triple or higher multiple points are created.

The map f restricted to any one circle is called a **component**.

Two representatives are said to be **equivalent** if they are equivalent under the equivalence generated by the following:

1. Homeomorphic equivalence,
2. Homotopy through doodle representatives, and
3. Surface surgery disjoint from the image of the doodle representative.

These will be explained later.

Definition 2.1. A **doodle** is an equivalence class of doodle representatives.

As is the usual custom, we will often not distinguish between a doodle and its representative.

A doodle representative is **regular** if it is smooth and the singular points are a finite number of transverse crossings. Clearly any doodle can be regularly represented. The image of a regular representative is a union of immersed curves, which is sometimes called a **diagram** or a **doodle diagram** on the surface.

The pair (Σ, f) of a closed oriented surface and a doodle representative on it is also referred to as a doodle representative. The pair (Σ, D) of a closed oriented surface and a doodle diagram on it is also referred to as a doodle diagram (on a surfce) or a doodle representative.

A doodle is **planar** if it has a representative on the 2-sphere. In this case, we can describe a diagram on $\mathbb{R}^2 = S^2 \setminus \{\text{a point}\}$.

Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 are diagrams of two planar doodles. The first, called the **poppy**, has one component and the other with 3 components is called the **borromean** doodle. These are the first members of an infinite family of planar doodles considered later in the paper.



Figure 1: The poppy.



Figure 2: The Borromean doodle.

The **Hopf doodle** is represented by the longitude and meridian of a torus. That is $S^1 \times * \cup * \times S^1 \subset S^1 \times S^1$.

(1) Homeomorphic equivalence means that the doodles are "topologically the same". So for two doodles $f : \coprod_i S^1_i \to \Sigma$ and $g : \coprod_i S^1_i \to \Sigma'$ with the same number of components there are orientation-preserving homeomorphisms $s : \coprod_i S^1_i :\to \coprod_i S^1_i$ and $t : \Sigma \to \Sigma'$ with $t \circ f = g \circ s$. (When we consider **unoriented** doodles, we do not require s to be orientation-preserving.)

(2) Any homotopy of regular doodles can be assumed to be divided up into Reidemeister type moves: H_1^+ which generates a curl, H_1^- which deletes a curl, H_2^+ which generates a bigon and H_2^- which deletes it.

Under H_1^+ a self crossing point P and a monogon with empty interior are introduced and under H_1^- both are eliminated.

Under H_2^+ two crossing point P, Q are introduced and a bigon with empty interior between them. The crossing points may or may not be crossings of different components. Under H_2^- the crossing points and the bigon are eliminated.



Figure 3: $H_1^{\pm 1}$.



Figure 4: $H_2^{\pm 1}$.

(3) Surface surgery can be divided into a sequence of handle additions, h^+, and handle eliminations, h^-. These operations have to be disjoint from the doodle. Handle addition can be described as follows. Let D_0, D_1 be disjoint closed discs in the surface disjoint from the diagram. Remove the interiors of the discs and add an annulus, $A = S^1 \times [0,1]$, by its boundary to the boundary of the discs. The circle $b = S^1 \times 1/2$ is called the **belt** of the handle.



Figure 5: A handle.

The elimination of a handle is the reverse of this procedure. Let b, (the belt of a handle), be an essential curve in the surface disjoint from the doodle. Then a regular neighbourhood, A of b is homeomorphic to an annulus and can be chosen disjoint from the doodle. Remove the interior of the annulus and glue two discs via their boundary circles to the boundary of the annulus.

Definition 2.2. Two doodle diagrams (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') are **neighbourhood equivalent** if $(N(D,\Sigma), D)$ is homeomorphic to $(N(D',\Sigma'), D')$ where $N(D,\Sigma)$ and $N(D',\Sigma')$ are regular neighbourhoods of D in Σ and D' in Σ'.

By definition, neighbourhood equivalent doodle diagrams represent the same doodle.

Let $(\Sigma_1, D_1), \ldots, (\Sigma_n, D_n)$ be doodle diagrams. Suppose that a doodle diagram (Σ, D) is obtained from these by applying $n-1$ handle additions avoiding the diagrams $D_1, \ldots, D_n$, then we call (Σ, D) a **doodle union** of $(\Sigma_1, D_1), \ldots, (\Sigma_n, D_n)$ and denote it by $(\Sigma_1, D_1) \circ \cdots \circ (\Sigma_n, D_n)$. A doodle union is not unique up to homeomorphic equivalence, but it is unique up to neighbourhood equivalence and hence represents a unique doodle. Moreover it is easily observed that if $[(\Sigma_i, D_i)] = [(\Sigma_i', D_i')]$ as doodles for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ then

$$[(\Sigma_1, D_1) \circ \cdots \circ (\Sigma_n, D_n)] = [(\Sigma_1, D_1) \circ \cdots \circ (\Sigma_n, D_n)].$$

Note that under this equivalence we can assume that the ambient surface is connected.

Definition 2.3. A doodle is **splittable** if there exists a diagram which is a doodle union of two (or more) doodle diagrams. Otherwise it is **non-splittable**.

3 Flat Virtual Doodles

In this section we introduce the notion of a flat virtual doodle. In the next section it turns out that flat virtual doodles are equivalent to doodles defined in the previous section.

A **flat virtual doodle diagram** is an oriented 4-valent plane graph in $\mathbb{R}^2$ which is oriented and decorated at each vertex in one of the ways illustrated in Fig. 6.

Figure 6: A flat and a virtual crossing.

The decoration on the left of the figure is called a **flat** crossing and clearly represents two arcs meeting transversely. The decoration on the right is called a **virtual** crossing. It is similar but the crossing is encircled.

Two such diagrams are equivalent if they are related by a sequence of the following allowed moves, FR_1, FR_2, VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3, which are analogues of the Reidemeister moves. The equivalence class is called a **flat virtual doodle**.

We firstly consider allowed moves, FR_1 and FR_2 on flat crossings. The shaded areas, a monogon and a bigon, have interiors disjoint from the rest of the diagram.

Figure 7: The allowed move FR_1.

Figure 8: The allowed move FR_2.

We can divide these into two types: FR_1^+ which creates the monogon and FR_1^- which deletes it. Similarly we have FR_2^+ and FR_2^-.

The move corresponding to the third Reidemeister move which is allowed in the general theory of flat knots is forbidden in doodle theory.



Figure 9: The forbidden move FR_3.

Now we consider the allowed moves, VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 on virtual crossings. This time the analogue of the third Reidemeister move, VR_3, is allowed.

As in the flat case, there are versions $VR_1^{\pm 1}$ and $VR_2^{\pm 1}$. For VR_3 we can assume that all three arcs are oriented from left to right, (braid like), see [7].

Finally, we have a mixed move VFR_3, illustrated in Fig. 13, in which two consecutive virtual crossings appear to move past a flat crossing.

On the other hand, the move FVR_3 illustrated in Fig. 14, in which two consecutive flat crossings appear to move past a virtual crossing is forbidden.

Call a sub-path of the diagram which only passes only through virtual crossings a **virtual path**. It is a consequence of VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3 that a virtual path can be moved any where in the diagram keeping its end points fixed provided that the new crossings engendered by this are virtual. Kauffman calls this the **detour** move [13].

Remark 3.1. If we allow the forbidden move FR_3 then the theory of (flat virtual) doodles collapse to the theory of flat virtual knots and links. The diagram

Figure 10: VR_1.

Figure 11: VR_2.

depicted in Fig. 15 is a flat version of the Kishino knot. (The Kishino knot is a virtual knot introduced by T. Kishino, cf. [15]. For a proof of the non-triviality as a virtual knot, see [3], [15].) The flat version was proved to be non-trivial in [11] and also in [10]. Thus the flat Kishino knot is also non-trivial as a flat virtual doodle. Fig. 16 illustrates the Kishino knot as a doodle representative, on a genus-2 surface. Such a doodle representation is discussed in the next section.

Remark 3.2. If we continue to forbid FR_3 but allow the previously forbidden move FVR_3 then we get the theory of welded doodles. So far we have not been able to prove that non-trivial examples exist.

4 Flat Virtual Doodles and Doodles are the Same

In this section we show that doodles and flat virtual doodles are equivalent. Throughout this section doodle representatives are described as doodle diagrams on surfaces.

First we explain how to obtain a doodle representative, i.e. a doodle diagram on a surface, from a flat virtual doodle diagram.

Let K be a flat virtual doodle diagram. Let $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ be regular neighbourhoods of the flat crossings of K and put $W := \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m N_i)$. The intersection $K \cap W$ is a union of arcs and loops immersed in W. (Each intersection point of $K \cap W$ is a virtual crossing of K. A loop appears when K has a component on which there are no flat crossings.)

Thickening the arcs and loops in W, we obtain bands and annuli immersed in W whose cores are $K \cap W$. The union of these bands and annuli with $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ is a compact oriented surface immersed in $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Here we assume the orientation of the surface is induced from the orientation



Figure 12: VR_3.



Figure 13: The allowed move VFR_3.

of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Replacing it in neighbourhoods of virtual crossings as in Fig. 17 in $\mathbb{R}^3$, we obtain a compact oriented surface, F, embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and a diagram, D_F, with flat crossings on it. We denote the pair (F, D_F) by $\varphi(K)$. Here the pair (F, D_F) is considered up to homeomorphic equivalence, and we ignore how it is embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Attaching 2-disks, annuli, or even any compact connected oriented surfaces to F along the boundary, we have a closed oriented surface Σ and a doodle disgram D such that $(N(D, \Sigma), D)$ is homeomorphic to $\varphi(K)$, where $N(D, \Sigma)$ stands for a regular neighborhood of D in Σ. We call D or the pair (Σ, D) a **doodle diagram associated to** K. Note that if (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') are doodle diagrams associated to K, then they are neighbourhood equivalent and hence they represent the same doodle. The **doodle associated to** K is the doodle represented by a doodle disgram associated to K.

For an example see Fig. 15 and Fig. 16.

Proposition 4.1. *Let K and K' be flat virtual doodle diagrams and let (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') be doodle disgrams associated to K and K' respectively. If K and K' are equivalent as flat virtual doodles, then (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') are equivalent as doodles.*

By Proposition 4.1 we have a map

$$\Phi : \{\text{flat virtual doodles}\} \to \{\text{doodles}\}$$

with $\Phi([K]) = [(\Sigma, D)]$ where (Σ, D) is a doodle diagram associated to K.

Theorem 4.2. *The map Φ is bijective.*

We prove Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 by a similar argument to [5, 12].

Let K be a flat virtual doodle diagram. Let $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ be regular neighbourhoods of the flat crossings of K and put $W := \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m N_i)$. Let K' be



Figure 14: The forbidden move FVR_3.



Figure 15: The flat Kishino as a flat virtual diagram.

another flat virtual doodle diagram with m flat crossings. Let σ be a bijection from the set of flat crossings of K to that of K'. Using an isotopy of $\mathbb{R}^2$, we assume that each flat crossing of K and the corresponding flat crossing of K' under σ are the same point of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and that K and K' are identical in $N_1, \ldots, N_m$. We say that K and K' have the same **Gauss data** with respect to σ if there is a bijection τ from the set of arcs and loops of $K \cap W$ to that of $K' \cap W$ such that for every arc e of $K \cap W$ the endpoints of e equal the endpoints of $\tau(e)$.

Lemma 4.3. Let K and K' be flat virtual doodle diagrams. The following conditions are mutually equivalent.

(1) They are related by a finite sequence of moves VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3 modulo isotopy of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

(2) They are related by a finite sequence of detour moves modulo isotopy of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

(3) They have the same Gauss data with respect to a bijection between their flat crossings.

(4) $\varphi(K)$ is homeomorphic to $\varphi(K')$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Since moves VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3 are detour moves, it is trivial.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Since detour moves do not change Gauss data, it is trivial.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Using an isotopy of $\mathbb{R}^2$, we assume that each flat crossing of K and the corresponding flat crossing of K' are the same point of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and that K



Figure 16: The flat Kishino on a surface of genus 2.



Figure 17: Topological interpretation of a virtual crossing.

and K' are identical in $N_1, \ldots, N_m$. Move the arcs and loops of $K \cap W$ to the corresponding ones of $K' \cap W$ by a homotopy in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Taking such a homotopy generically, we have a finite sequence of moves VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3.

(3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4). It is obvious. □

Lemma 4.4. If K' is obtained from K by $FR_1^{\pm}$ or $FR_2^{\pm}$, then there exist doodle diagrams (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') associated to K and K' respectively such that $\Sigma = \Sigma'$ and D' is obtained from D by $H_1^{\pm}$ or $H_2^{\pm}$ on Σ.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case where K' is obtained from K by FR_1^- or FR_2^-. Let $\varphi(K) = (F, D_F)$. Attaching 2-disks to F along the boundary, we have a closed oriented surface $\tilde{F}$ in which there is a monogon or a bigon where H_1^- or H_2^- is applied. □

Proposition 4.1 follows from the previous lemmas.

Now we prove Theorem 4.2.

Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be the projection $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y)$.

Let (Σ, D) be a doodle diagram. By an abuse of notation let $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ also stand for regular neighbourhoods of crossings of D in Σ, and put $X := \mathrm{Cl}(\Sigma \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m N_i)$. The intersection $D \cap X$ is a union of arcs and loops embedded in X. The neighbourhoods of the arcs and loops in X are bands and annuli in X, and the union of these bands and annuli together with $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ forms a regular neighbourhood $N(D)$ of D in Σ. Consider an embedding $\tilde{g} : N(D) \to \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\tilde{g}(\cup_{i=1}^m N_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ and $g := \pi \circ \tilde{g} : N(D) \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is an orientation-preserving immersion whose singularity set is a union of transverse intersections among bands and annuli. Regard $g(D)$ as a flat virtual doodle diagram, say

K, such that the flat crossings are in $g(\cup_{i=1}^{m} N_i)$ and the virtual crossings are in the intersections of bands and annuli. By definition, $(N(D), D)$ is $\varphi(K)$ and (Σ, D) is a doodle diagram associated to K. We call K a **flat virtual doodle diagram associated to** (Σ, D). This implies that the map Φ is surjective.

Now we prove that Φ is injective. Let (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') be doodle diagrams and let K and K' be their associated flat virtual doodle diagrams.

(1) Suppose that (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') are neighbourhood equivalent. Then K and K' have the same Gauss data with respect to a bijection between their flat crossings. By Lemma 3.1, we see that K and K' represent the same flat virtual doodle.

(2) Suppose that $\Sigma = \Sigma'$ and D' is obtained from D by a move H_1^- or H_2^-. In the construction of K and K', taking embeddings $\tilde{g} : N(D) \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\tilde{g}' : N(D') \to \mathbb{R}^3$ suitably, we can obtain $K = g(D)$ and $K' = g'(D')$ such that K' is obtained from K by a move FR_1^- or FR_2^-. Thus K and K' represent the same flat virtual doodle.

(3) Suppose that $\Sigma = \Sigma'$ and D' is obtained from D by a move H_1^+ or H_2^+. From the previous case, we see that K and K' represent the same flat virtual doodle.

Therefore we see that Φ is injective. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.2.

5 Minimal Doodle Representatives

In this section we see that every doodle has a unique representative doodle diagram which is minimal with respect to the number of crossing points and the genus of the underlying surface. To do this we first formalise a procedure which is common in mathematical proofs and was introduced by Newman, [18]. It has since been recently considered by Matveev, [17] and Bergman, [4].

Let G be a graph. We will denote the vertices of G by capital Roman letters and the edges by their end points: for example $e = KL$.

As usual, a **path** in G from A to B is a sequence of vertices

$$A = K_0, K_1, K_2, \cdots, K_{n-1}, K_n = B$$

in which $K_{i-1}K_i$ is an edge, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

A path is called **simple** if it has no re-entrant vertices, $K_i = K_j$ where $0 < i < j < n$. Any path can be replaced by a simple path with the same end points.

We will call G a **graph with levels** if each verticex, K, of G has a level, $|K|$, which is an element of a totally ordered set, called the **level set**, and that any two end vertices of an edge have different levels. This defines an ordering on the edges of G. If an edge e of G has vertices K and L and $|K| > |L|$ then e is oriented from K to L. We will write an edge oriented in this manner as $e = K \searrow L$ or $L \swarrow K$ and picture K on the page as being above L. We say that K **collapses** to L or L **expands** to K.

A path of the form

$$A \searrow K_1 \searrow K_2 \cdots \searrow K_{n-1} \searrow B$$

is called a **descending** path. The inverse of a descending path is called an **ascending** path.

The first condition we impose on G is the **finite descending path property**.

FDPP: There are no infinite descending paths.

A **root** of G is a sink. That is a vertex, R, with no outgoing edges, $R \searrow L$. So a root is a local minimum.

Lemma 5.1. If a graph with levels has the FDPP property then every vertex is either a root or is connected to a root by a descending path.

Proof. If K is not a root then it has a descending edge, $K \searrow K_1$. If K_1 is not a root it has a descending edge, $K_1 \searrow K_2$ and so on. By the FDPP property this process must terminate after a finite number of steps with a root. □

From now on we will assume that all graphs have the FDPP. Having this condition, which guarantees the existence of roots, we now look at conditions which make the root unique.

To this end we consider the **unique root property** and the **diamond condition**.

URP: Every pair of vertices in a path component descend to a unique root.

To define the diamond condition we need a few definitions.

A **peak, (valley)** is an ascending (descending) path composed with a descending (ascending) path. A peak (valley) is **simple** if it consists of just two edges.

DC: Any peak can be replaced by a valley with the same end points. In particular if U descends to X and Y then either $X = Y$ or there is a vertex V which ascends to X and Y.



Lemma 5.2. URP and DC are equivalent conditions.

Proof. Suppose a graph has the URP and U descends to X and Y. Then X and Y are clearly in the same path component and so both descend to a common root, V say.

Conversely suppose the graph has the DC and X descends to different roots R_1 and R_2. Then unless $R_1 = R_2$ this contradicts the DC. So every vertex descends to a unique root.

Now suppose that X and Y are joined by a path

$$X = K_0, K_1, K_2, \cdots, K_{n-1}, K_n = Y$$

and yet descend to different roots R_1 and R_2. Then somewhere in the path, vertices K_i and K_{i+1} descend to different roots. We may as well assume that $K_i \searrow K_{i+1}$. Then K_i descends to one root and via K_{i+1} to another, contradicting the above. □

We say that a graph with levels is a **proof reduction** graph if it has both the FDPP and the DC/URP properties. By the above, all path components of a proof reduction graph have a unique root. This is clearly a useful property but we need practical methods to recognise such a graph. We do this by localising the DC as follows.

LDC: A graph has the **local diamond condition** if given a simple peak $X \swarrow U \searrow Y$ there is a path, $X = K_0, K_1, K_2, \cdots, K_{n-1}, K_n = Y$, from X to Y such that if the path contains a simple peak $K_{i-1} \swarrow K_i \searrow K_{i+1}$ then there is an edge $U \searrow K_i$.

Lemma 5.3. The local diamond condition, LDC and the diamond condition, DC are equivalent.

Proof. Clearly DC implies LDC because a valley does not have a peak.

Now consider a graph with the LDC. Because of FDPP every vertex which is not a root is connected to at least one root by a descending path. Our task is to show that this root is unique.

Let us call a vertex **regular** if it is connected to a unique root by a descending path: otherwise we call it **irregular**. Clearly regular vertices exist. A root is an example. Our task is to show that irregular vertices do not exist. We will assume the contrary and obtain a contradiction.

In that case there must be an irregular vertex L such that for every edge $L \searrow K$, the vertex K is regular. If not we could construct an infinite descending path of irregular vertices. Indeed, we will chose L so that every descending path from L must consist of regular vertices apart from L.

For such an irregular vertex L there is a simple peak $X \swarrow L \searrow Y$ such that X, Y descend to unique but different roots. Chose X and Y so that the path, $X = K_0, K_1, K_2, \cdots, K_{n-1}, K_n = Y$ predicted by the LDC has shortest possible length.

The hypothesis of the LDC means that if the path joining X to Y has a simple peak $K_{i-1} \swarrow K_i \searrow K_{i+1}$ as a subpath then there is an edge $L \searrow K_i$. This means that K_i is regular and so descends to a unique root.

This root must be different from one of the distinct roots of the pair X, Y. So either the pair X, K_i or the pair K_i, Y has a shorter path.

So the path joining X to Y has no simple peaks and is therefore either a) ascending, b) descending or c) a valley. If a) or b) then X, Y have a common root. If c) and If V is the base of this valley then V has a unique root which must be the same for X and Y.

Therefore irregular vertices cannot exist and all vertices are regular and connected to a unique root by a descending path. Hence the URP is satisfied which implies the LDC. □

We now consider examples of proof reduction graphs.

Example 5.4 (Free Groups)**.** The vertices are words in the symbols $x \in X$ and $x^{-1} \in X^{-1}$. The level of a word is its length. The expansions are insertions of pairs xx^{-1} or $x^{-1}x$ in the words. It is easy to see that this has the local diamond condition. Hence every word is equivalent to a unique reduced word.

Example 5.5 (The singular braid monoid embeds in a group, [8])**.** Here the vertices are singular braids up to braid equivalence. The expansions are the introduction of pairs of cancelling singular crossings. The levels are the number of singular crossings.

The graph, $\mathcal{D}$, we are interested in has vertices consisting of pairs $S = (\Sigma, D)$, where D is a doodle in its ambient surface Σ. These are equivalent up to homeomorphic equivalence and a move called a **floating** move which we now describe. A **floating component** is a component which is the boundary of a disc disjoint from the rest of the diagram. A floating move picks up this disc and places it anywhere else on the surface disjoint from the rest of the diagram. The level of a vertex is the number of crossing points plus the genus of the surface and the number of connected components of the surface. The moves $H_1^{\pm 1}, H_2^{\pm 1}$ and $h^{\pm 1}$ raise or lower the level and correspond to the edges of the graph.

Theorem 5.6. *The graph, $\mathcal{D}$, of doodle diagrams with moves and levels defined earlier is a proof reduction graph.*

Proof. We will show that $\mathcal{D}$ has the LDC by looking at the possible cases.

Suppose S_1, S_2, S_3 is a sequence of diagrams created by $H_1^{\pm 1}, H_2^{\pm 1}$ moves such that $S_1 \swarrow S_2 \searrow S_3$. The first move creates a region R and the second destroys a region R'. If $R = R'$ then the two moves cancel and S_1 is the same as S_3. The other cases are illustrated in Fig. 18.

In case a) the regions R and R' are disjoint so by reversing the order of the moves there is an intermediate S_2' such that $S_1 \searrow S_2' \swarrow S_3$. The figure illustrates an H_2^+ and an H_1^-.

In case b) the regions R and R' have a point in common. The region R is created by an H_2^+ move and the region R' is created accidentally. The region R' is then deleted by an H_2^- move (subcase b-i, on the left of the figure) or by an H_1^- move (subcase b-ii, on the right of the figure). In case b-i) both moves can be dispensed with since S_1 is homeomorphic to S_3. In case b-ii) the result, S_3, could have been created with an H_1^+ move. So S_1 is joined to S_3 by an edge.

In case c) the regions R and R' have two points in common. This implies the existence of a floating circle which can be moved anywhere.

We now consider mixtures of $h^{\pm 1}$ and $H_1^{\pm 1}, H_2^{\pm 1}$ moves.

Suppose we have a simple peak $S_1 \swarrow S_2 \searrow S_3$. There are various cases to consider. Let $S_1 \swarrow S_2$ be an H_1^+ move and $S_2 \searrow S_3$ an h^- move. The



Figure 18: The regions R and R'.

expansion creates a monogon and the handle elimination takes place along an essential curve which is disjoint from the doodle and hence disjoint from the monogon. It follows that the two operations can be reversed.

A similar argument holds if the initial expansion creates a bigon with an H_2^+ move.

Now consider $S_1 \swarrow S_2 \searrow S_3$ in which the first expansion makes a handle from the boundary of disks D_1 and D_2 and the second move eliminates a bigon (or monogon). In either case this must be disjoint from the two disks in order to happen so the two moves can be reversed.

Finally, suppose the expansion, $S_1 \swarrow S_2$, creates a handle and the collapse, $S_2 \searrow S_3$, deletes a handle. This means that in the middle diagram S_2 there is a simple closed curve b_1 which is the belt of the added handle and a simple closed curve b_2 upon which the surgery takes place. Both curves are disjoint from the immersed curves which represent the doodle, D.

If b_1 and b_2 are disjoint then either S_1 and S_3 are homeomorphic if they are parallel or we can reverse the operations and there is nothing more to prove. If b_1 and b_2 are not disjoint then we can assume that they meet transversely. Let A_1 and A_2 be annular neighbourhoods of b_1 and b_2. If these are sufficiently thin then,

1. the components of $A_1 \cap A_2$ are square neighbourhoods of the intersection points of b_1 and b_2,

2. $A_1 \cup A_2$ is a connected surface with boundary,

3. $A_1 \cup A_2$ is disjoint from the immersed curves which represent the doodle.

Let the components of $\partial(A_1 \cup A_2)$ be $c_1 \cup c_2 \cup \cdots \cup c_n$.

If each c_i is inessential then it spans a disc D_i in the surface Σ. So the (topological) components of the doodle each lie in a disc. It follows that the doodle lies on the union of spheres which can be tubed together to make one sphere, so the doodle is planar.

Otherwise, at least one of the boundary components is essential: call it c. Then c is disjoint from b_1 and b_2. Let S' be the result of surgery on c in S_2. Let S'', (S''') be the result of surgery on b_1, (b_2) in S'. Note that S'', (S''') is also the result of surgery on c in S_1, (S_3).

So there is a path $S_1 \searrow S'' \swarrow S' \searrow S''' \swarrow S_3$ and an edge $S_2 \searrow S'$ which implies the local diamond condition.

It follows that the conditions of the proof reduction graph are satisfied and the theorem is proved. □

We call a diagram **minimal** if the interior of every region is simply connected and there are no monogons and bigons. We can now prove a theorem, which is similar to Kuperberg's theorem on virtual links ([16]).

Theorem 5.7. *If two minimal diagrams represent the same doodle then they are homeomorphic.*

Proof. Since there are no monogons and bigons, no H_1^-, H_2^- moves can be initiated. Because the regions are simply connected the same is true for h^- moves. It follows that a minimal diagram represents a root and roots are unique. Noting that a simple loop loop in S^2 is a unique diagram which is minimal and has a floating component, we see the result. □

6 Minimal Doodles

In this section we will look at minimal diagrams of doodles.

6.1 Minimal Doodle Diagrams and Minimal Flat Virtual Doodle Diagrams

It follows from 5.4 that the poppy and the Borromean doodle are non-trivial because they have no monogons or bigons to start a collapse and the surface has genus zero. Similarly the Hopf doodle whose one region is a square is non-trivial.

The following is an example of a minimal doodle with one component on the torus and with 8 crossings.



Figure 19: A minimal doodle with one component and 8 crossings on a torus.

Although the minimum genus is never greater than the minimum number of virtual crossings it is quite easy to find examples where the inequality is strict. For example the following doodle with three components lives on the torus but has 2 virtual crossings.



Figure 20: A genus 1 doodle with at least 2 virtual crossings.

However it may be possible to amalgamate virtual crossings. If we take two consecutive virtual crossings on a virtual path then a surgery around the bases of the two handle representations means that the two handles can be replaced by one. If we apply this to the doodle in Fig. 20 we can represent it on a torus.

Indeed we can generalize this as follows. Define a **virtual area** in a flat virtual doodle diagram to be a square transverse to the diagram in which arcs enter in an edge and exit through the opposite edge with all the crossing points inside the square virtual. All these virtual crossings can be replaced by one handle.

Suppose $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$ is a collection of virtual areas in a flat virtual doodle diagram which cover all the virtual crossings. Suppose that k, the number of areas, is minimal. Clearly k is not less than the genus. In fact it is equal to the genus as we now demonstrate.

Let K be a flat virtual doodle diagram. A collection of virtual areas, say $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$, is a **virtual area covering** of K if they covers all virtual crossings and if they are mutually disjoint. Let $\mathrm{va}(K)$ denote the minimum cardinal number of all virtual area coverings of the diagram K. When K has no virtual crossings, we assume $\mathrm{va}(K) = 0$. We call $\mathrm{va}(K)$ the **virtual area number** of K.

Let $k = \mathrm{va}(K)$. Obviously there is a doodle representative D on a closed



Figure 21: Topological interpretation of a virtual area.

surface F corresponding to K such that the genus of F is k. Thus k is not less than the genus of the doodle $[D]$, that is the minimal genus of all ambient surfaces of doodle representatives belonging to the doodle $[D]$.

For the equivalence class $[K]$ of K, we define $\mathrm{va}([K])$ by the minimum number among all $\mathrm{va}(K')$ such that K' is equivalent to K. We call it the **virtual area number** of the flat virtual doodle $[K]$.

Let Φ be the bijection from the family of flat virtual doodles to the family of doodles defined in Section 4.

Proposition 6.1. *Let K be a flat virtual doodle diagram and D a doodle such that $\Phi([K]) = [D]$. Then the virtual area number of the flat virtual doodle $[K]$ equals the genus of the doodle $[D]$.*

Proof. First we show that $g([D]) \leq \mathrm{va}([K])$. Let K' be a flat virtual doodle diagram with $[K'] = [K]$ and $\mathrm{va}(K') = \mathrm{va}([K])$. Obviously, there is a doodle representative D' on a closed surface F' with $[D'] = \Phi([K'])$ $(= \Phi([K]) = [D])$ and $g(F') = \mathrm{va}(K')$. Thus $g([D]) = g([D']) \leq g(F') = \mathrm{va}(K') = \mathrm{va}([K])$.

We show that $g([D]) \geq \mathrm{va}([K])$. Let D' be a doodle representative on a closed surface F' with $[D'] = [D]$ and $g(F') = g([D])$. Let $g = g(F')$. Consider a standard handle decomposition of F', say $H^0 \cup H^1_1 \cup \cdots \cup H^1_{2g} \cup H^2$, where we assume that the attaching areas of the 1-handles appear in the order $H^1_1, H^1_2, H^1_1, H^1_2, H^1_3, H^1_4, H^1_3, H^1_4, \ldots$ on the boudary of H^0. By moving D' by an isotopy of F', we may assume that (1) all flat crossings of D' are in the interior of the 0-handle H^0, (2) for each 1-handle H^1_i the intersection of $D' \cap H^1_i$ is empty or some arcs that are parallel copies of the core of the 1-handle, and (3) D' is disjoint from the 2-handle H^2. Consider an immmersion of $H^0 \cup H^1_1 \cup \cdots \cup H^1_{2g}$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that the restriction of each handle is an embedding and the multiple point set consists of the transverse intersections of pairs of 1-handles H^1_{2i-1} and H^1_{2i} for $i = 1, \ldots, g$. Then we have a flat virtual doodle diagram, say K', such that $\Phi([K']) = [D']$ and K' has a virtual area coveing whose cardinal number is less than or equal to g. Thus, $\mathrm{va}([K']) \leq g$. Since $\Phi([K']) = [D'] = [D] = \Phi[K]$, we have $[K'] = [K]$. Thus $\mathrm{va}([K]) = \mathrm{va}([K']) \leq g = g(F') = g([D])$. □

Remark 6.2. Clearly a result, similar to the above result, can be proved for virtual knots.

So far we have considered minimal doodle diagrams on a surface. Define a flat virtual doodle diagram in the plane, consisting of flat crossings and virtual crossings, to be **minimal** if its associated doodle diagram is minimal.

Proposition 6.3. *Two minimal flat virtual doodle diagrams representing the same flat virtual doodle are related by a finite sequence of moves VR_1, VR_2, VR_3 and VFR_3 modulo isotopy of $\mathbb{R}^2$. In other words, a minimal flat virtual doodle diagram is unique up to detour moves.*

Proof. Let K and K' be minimal flat virtual doodle diagrams representing the same flat virtual doodle. Let (Σ, D) and (Σ', D') be minimal doodle diagrams associated with K and K'. By Theorem 5.7, they are homeomorphic, and hence K and K' have the same Gauss data. By Lemma 4.3, we have the result. □

6.2 Minimal Doodles and Cell Decompositions of Surfaces

Let D be a minimal doodle on a closed connected oriented surface of genus g. Then the crossings, edges and regions form a cell decomposition of the ambient surface. Let V be the number of crossings, E the number of edges and F the number of regions. Let F_i be the number of i-gon regions, $i = 3, 4, \ldots$.

Lemma 6.4. With the notation above,

(I_1) $E = 2V$

(I_2) $F = V + 2 - 2g$

(I_3) $V - 6 + 6g = F_4 + 2F_5 + 3F_6 + \cdots$

Proof. Every vertex contributes 4 to the number of edges twice over. This proves identity I_1. The formula for the Euler-Poincaré number is $V - E + F = 2 - 2g$. Substituting I_1 gives I_2. Each i-gon contributes i edges to E. Each edge is the edge of 2 regions. So $4V = 2E = 3F_3 + 4F_4 + \cdots$ But $6 + 3V - 6g = 3F = 3F_3 + 3F_4 + \cdots$ Taking the difference implies I_3. □

Theorem 6.5. *Consider minimal doodles on the 2-sphere.*

1. *They have at least 6 crossings.*
2. *There is only one with 6 crossings: the Borromean doodle.*
3. *There are none with 7 crossings.*
4. *There is only one with 8 crossings: the poppy.*

Proof. (1) It follows immediately from identity I_3.
(2) If $V = 6$ then I_3 implies that there are only triangular regions. These form the octahedral decomposition of the 2-sphere.
(3) If $V = 7$ then I_3 implies that there exists a single tetragonal region and other regions are all triangular regions. Let $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ be the vertices (crossings) of the tetragonal region, and $\{u_0, u_1, u_2\}$ the other three vertices. Note that two successive edges among the four edges v_iv_{i+1} $(i = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ bounding the tetragonal region never bound a triangular region. Thus for each edge v_iv_{i+1} $(i = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ of tetragonal region, there is a vertex w_i $(i = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ $\in \{u_0, u_1, u_2\}$ such that $v_iv_{i+1}w_i$ is a triangular region. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $w_0 = w_2 = x$, $w_1 = a$ and $w_3 = b$ as in Fig. 22, where the tetragonal region is outer-most. Two edges which connects to the crossing a (or b) are not depicted in this figure. It is impossible to draw such edges under this circumstance.



Figure 22: No minimal planar doodle diagram with 7 crossings.

(4) I_3 implies that either
(4-1) $F_4 = 2$ and $F_i = 0$ for $i > 4$ or
(4-2) $F_5 = 1$ and $F_i = 0$ for $i = 4$ and for $i > 5$.
By a similar argument with (3) we see that case (4-1) does not occur. In case (4-1), there are two tetragonal regions. If they are disjoint, then we have the poppy. If they share one or two vertices, we have a contradiction. □

Further example of computer generated doodles are illustrated in an appendix

6.3 Infinite sequences of doodles

Because we can recognize non-trivial doodles without 1-gons or 2-gons it is easy to invent sequences of different doodles. Here we define some sequences of plane doodles whose early members have other interpretations.

There is a sequence of doodles $B_3, B_4, \ldots$ starting with the Borromean doodle, B_3 and the poppy, B_4. Let the vertices of the two concentric n-gons be $X_1X_2 \ldots X_n$ and $Y_1Y_2 \ldots Y_n$. Construct the squares $X_iX_{i+1}Y_{i+1}Y_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ cyclically mod n. Join the diagonals X_i to Y_{i+1} sequentially to create the triangles. This defines B_n. It has $2n$ vertices, $2n$ triangular faces and 2 n-gon faces. The number of components is 3 if n is divisible by 3 and 1 otherwise.

Another two sequences can be defined by taking 2 concentric n-gons separated by a concentric 2n-gon and filling in the annular regions with alternate

squares and triangles. This can be done in two ways so that at the 2n-gon each square or triangle in one annulus abutts a single square or triangle in the other annulus. So taking nomenclature from the classification of polyhedra, we have **Gyro**, C'_n, which has the squares abutted by a common edge to the triangles whilst **Ortho**, C''_n, has the squares abutted by a common edge to the squares and the triangles abutted to the triangles. Both C'_n and C''_n have $4n$ vertices, $F_n = 2$ and $F_3 = F_4 = 2n$. The doodles C'_n and C''_n for $n > 3$ can be distinguished by the number of components. For $n = 3$ both C'_3 and C''_3 have 4 components and a similar number of triangular and square regions. They are illustrated below and can be distinguished by the combinatorics of their regions.



Figure 23: C'_3 and C''_3.

We can describe C'_3 and C''_3 as follows. Consider the Borromean doodle, B_3, with circular components (see Fig. 2). Now draw a circle separating the innermost triangular region from the outermost triangular region. This describes C'_3. To obtain C''_3, perform an R_3 move on the innermost triangular region.



Figure 24: C'_3 and C''_3 with circular components.

If we remove the innermost circle from C'_3 and C''_3 we get the Borromean doodle and the trivial doodle with three components respectively. This is another proof that C'_3 and C''_3 are distinct.

Lemma 6.6. 1. The doodle C'_n has four components if n is divisible by 3. Otherwise C'_n has two components.

2. The doodle C''_n has $n+1$ components.

Proof. Firstly note that the central 2n-gon is one of the components in both cases.

(1) Let the vertices around one of the n-gons be $P_1 \dots P_n$. A component of C'_n containing the edge P_iP_{i+1}, contains the edge $P_{i+3}P_{i+4}$.

(2) For C''_n each component which isn't the central $2n$-gon is a hexagon containing the edge P_iP_{i+1}, $i = 1, \dots n \bmod n$, and there are n of these. □

Remark 6.7 (A Note on Planar Doodles and Polyhdra). There is a bijection between minimal planar doodles and the 1-skeleta of 3-dimensional polehdra whose vertices have valency four. It is well known that the Borromean doodle, B_3 is the 1-skeleton of the octahedron. In general B_n is the 1-skeleton of the n-gon antiprism, see [6] for definitions.

Furthermore C'_3 is the 1-skeleton of the cuboctahedron and C''_3 is the 1-skeleton of the anticuboctahedron or triangular orthobicupola which is Johnson's solid J_{27}. C'_4/C'_5 and $C''_4/\ C''_5$ are also 1-skeleta of Johnson solids: J_{29}/J_{31}: the square gyrobicupola/pentagonal gyrobicupola and J_{28}/J_{30}: the square orthobicupola/pentagonal orthobicupola. Further bicupola for $n > 5$ can not be realised with regular faces.

We are grateful to Peter Cromwell for this information.

6.4 The ± 1 construction

Let D be a doodle diagram on a surface Σ. Suppose that D has a region R with at least four edges and chose two disjoint edges e_1 and e_2 of R. Remove the interiors of the edges and join the dangling vertices with two diagonal arcs meeting at a new point X in the interior of R. This creates a new doodle diagram D'. We write $D \overset{+1}{\to} D'$ or $D' \overset{-1}{\to} D$ and call D an **ancestor** of D' and D' a **descendant** of D. The number of components of D' changes from that of D by 0 or ± 1, depending how e_1 and e_2 are oriented and placed.

Lemma 6.8. Let D' have an ancestor D. Then D' is minimal if and only if D is minimal.

The following diagram illustrates how the poppy is the ancestor of (the unique) minimal diagram with 9 crossings and (the unique) two component minimal diagram with 10 crossings.



Figure 25: Descendants of the poppy.

A minimal diagram without ancestors is called **fundamental**. The following lemma gives a procedure for recognising whether a diagram is fundamental or not.

Lemma 6.9. If a minimal diagram has an ancestor, then there is a crossing X satisfying one of the following.

1. There are two distinct regions appearing in a diagonal position about X such that they are a p'-gon and a q'-gon for some $p' > 3$ and $q' > 3$.

2. There is a region appearing in a diagonal position about X such that it is an r'-gon for some $r' > 5$.

Proof. Let D' be a descendant of D. Let e_1 , e_2 and R be the edges and the region of D that were used to produce D'. (1) Consider a case that the regions containing e_1 and e_2, beside R, are distinct. Suppose they are p-gon and q-gon. Since D is minimal, $p > 2$ and $q > 2$. After applying the $+1$ construction, these regions become a p'-region and a q'-region with $p' = p + 1$ and $q' = q + 1$. (2) Consider a case that the regions containing e_1 and e_2, beside R, are the same region of D. Suppose it is an r-gon. Since the boundary of this region contain e_1 and e_2, we have $r > 3$. By the $+1$ construction, this region becomes an r'-region with $r' = r + 2$. □

Theorem 6.10. *The generalised Borromean doodles are all fundamental.*

Proof. Their two regions with > 3 edges are protected by a ring of triangles. Thus there is no crossing satisfying the condition of the previous lemma. □

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 26287013 and 15K04879.

References

[1] Vladimir I. Arnold, *Plane curves, their invariants, perestroikas and classifications. With an appendix by F. Aicardi*, In: Singularities and Bifurcations, Adv. Soviet Math., 21, pp. 33–91, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[2] Vladimir I. Arnold, *Topological invariants of plane curves and caustics*, Dean Jacqueline B. Lewis Memorial Lectures presented at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. University Lecture Series, 5. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994.

[3] Andrew Bartholomew and Roger Fenn, *Quaternionic invariants of virtual knots and links*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 17 (2008), no. 2, 231–251.

[4] George M. Bergman, *The diamond lemma for ring theory*, Advances in Mathematics 29 (1978), 178–218.

[5] J. Scott Carter, Seiichi Kamada and Masahico Saito, *Stable equivalence of knots on surfaces and virtual knot cobordisms*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 11 (2002), no. 3, 311–322.

[6] Peter R. Cromwell, *Polyhedra*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[7] Roger Fenn, *Generalised biquandles for generalised knot theories*, New ideas in low dimensional topology, pp. 79–103, Ser. Knots Everything, 56, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2015.

[8] Roger Fenn, Ebru Keyman and Colin Rourke, *The singular braid monoid embeds in a group*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 7 (1998), no. 7, 881–892.

[9] Roger Fenn and Paul Taylor, *Introducing doodles*, Topology of low-dimensional manifolds (Proc. Second Sussex Conf., Chelwood Gate, 1977), pp. 37–43, Lecture Notes in Math., 722, Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[10] Roger Fenn and V. Turaev, *Weyl algebras and knots*, J. Geom. Phys. 57 (2007), 1313–I324.

[11] Teruhisa Kadokami, *Detecting non-triviality of virtual links*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 12 (2003), no. 6, 781–803.

[12] Naoko Kamada and Seiichi Kamada, *Abstract link diagrams and virtual knots*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 9 (2000), no. 1, 93–106.

[13] Louis H. Kauffman, *Virtual knot theory*, European J. Combin. 20 (1999), no. 7, 663–690.

[14] Mikhail Khovanov, *Doodle groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 349 (1997), 2297–2315.

[15] Toshimasa Kishino and Shin Satoh, *A note on classical knot polynomials*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications 13 (2004), no. 7, 845–856.

[16] Greg Kuperberg, *What is a virtual link?*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 3 (2003), no. 20, 587–591.

[17] Sergei Matveev, *Algorithmic topology and classification of 3-manifolds*, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 9, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2nd edition, 2007.

[18] M. H. A. Newman. *On theories with a combinatorial definition of "equivalence"*. Ann. of Math. (2), 43 (1942), 223–243.

A Appendix: Computer generated examples

A computer search has determined a number of distinct, non-trivial virtual doodles, classified by the numer of flat crossings each doodle contains. The search has found:

- 1 virtual doodle with three flat crossings
- 20 virtual doodles with four flat crossings
- 244 virtual doodles with five flat crossings
- 719 virtual doodles with six flat crossings
- 136 virtual doodles with seven flat crossings
- 8 virtual doodles with eight flat crossings
- 1 virtual doodles with nine flat crossings

The search results do not produce an exhaustive list of all possible virtual doodles with a given number of flat crossings. However, the doodles classified with n flat crossings are distinct from each other and also distinct from the doodles having m flat crossings where $m \neq n$.

Full details of the search, its results and the associated software may be found at http://www.layer8.co.uk/maths/doodles.

Presented below are diagrams of the distinct non-trivial virtual doodles with three and four flat crossings.



$d3.1$



$d4.1$



$d4.2$



$d4.3$



$d4.4$



$d4.5$



$d4.6$



$d4.7$



$d4.8$



$d4.9$



$d4.10$



$d4.11$



$d4.12$



$d4.13$



$d4.14$



$d4.15$



$d4.16$



$d4.17$



$d4.18$



$d4.19$



$d4.20$